


review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and Graham’s objections. As for those portions of the M&R to which Graham made no objection, the court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. As for the objections, Graham’s objection states that he “will be bringing a lawsuit” against the officers but does not otherwise dispute Judge Numbers’s conclusion in the M&R that Graham failed to state a claim against the Wayne County Sheriff’s Department. The court agrees with Magistrate Judge Number’s conclusion and dismisses the action without prejudice.

In sum, the court OVERRULES plaintiff’s objections to the M&R, GRANTS plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 2], ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 6], and DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE plaintiff’s complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted [D.E. 1]. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint not later than September 11, 2023.

SO ORDERED. This 11 day of August, 2023.


JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge